

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/020,091	Applicant(s) SANTILLI, RUGGERO MARIA	
	Examiner Kishor Mayekar	Art Unit 1753	

All Participants:

(1) Kishor Mayekar.

(2) Dennis LaPointe.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 January 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-61

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed with the attorney that the use of trademark and the term "magnecular clusters" in the response of 20 October 2004 is OK. Also proposed to clean up 1) the confusing of the use of the term "specific density" in the specification upon relating it to the atomic mass unit of the gas; 2) to completely delete the phrase "for increasing a specific density and an energy content of a gas" in the elected claims and the specification; 3) to clarify and amend the claimed limitation "a submerged magnetic field" as the term submerged related to the submerge in a liquid and not in a gas as claimed; 4) to incorporate the limitation of claim 56 into claim 1 in reference to the election of species; and 5) to cancel non-elected claims, so that the elected claims are in better form for allowance. Also, agreed that no new issue raises upon receiving the amendment after final Office action when the amendment follows the above proposals' guideline..